HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION (C) No. 2087 of 2007

PETITIONERS : 1. Gram Panchayat, Ramanujnagar, Janpad Panchayat – Ramanuj Nagar, Distt. Surguja [C.G.] Through it's Sarpanch, Smt. Puniya Bai, W/o. Shri Salikram, aged about 60 years, Caste- Gond [S.T.] R/o Ramanuj Nagar, Tah. Surajpur, Distt. Surguja [C.G]

2. Gram Panchayat, Bakirma, Janpad Panchayat – Prem Nagar, Distt. Surguja [C.G.] Through – it's Sarpanch, Smt. Panajo Bai W/o Shri Birang Singh, aged about 25 years, Caste – Gond [S.T.] R/o Bakirma, Tah. Surajpur, Distt. Surguja [C.G.]

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS : 1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through – Secretary, Department of School Education, D.K.S. Mantralaya, Raipur [C.G.]

2. Mission Director, State Project Officer, Rajiv Gandhi Shiksha Mission, Chhattisgarh, Raja Talab, Raipur [C.G.]

3. Collector and District Mission Director, Rajiv Gandhi Shiksha Mission [Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan], Ambikapur, Distt. Surguja [C.G.]

4. District Panchayat, Surguja, Through- it's Chief Executive Officer, Ramanujnagar, District Surguja [C.G.]

5. Janpad Panchayat, Ramanuj Nagar, Through – its Chief Executive Officer, Ramanuj Nagar, District Surguja [C.G.]

6. Janpad Panchayat, Prem Nagar, Through – it's Chief Executive Officer, Prem Nagar, District Surguja [C.G.]

(101)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

SB: Hon'ble Shri Satish K. Agnihotri, J.

Present: Shri J.K.Shastri, Advocate for the petitioners.
Shri A.S.Kachhwaha, Government Advocate for the State/ respondent No. 1 to 3.
None for respondent No. 4 to 6.

ORDER
(Passed on 17th day of September, 2007)

1. In this petition the grievance of the petitioners is that the respondents are not permitting the petitioners to carry out the construction works of school building.

2. On 12.04.2007, this petition was directed to be listed alongwith W.P. No. 7113 of 2006 and vide order dated 08.08.2007, this petition was also directed to be listed alongwith W.P.(C) Nos. 4065 of 2007 and 2949 of 2007. In those three connected petitions, notices were issued and despite service of notice, neither any representation is made nor anyone appears on behalf of respondents, except State.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents No. 1 to 3 submits that the remaining work of the school building, if any, in the petitioners Panchayats may be completed by the concerned Gram Panchayat.

4. In view of the categorical statement made by the learned counsel appearing for the respondent No. 1 to 3/State, learned counsel appearing for thepetitioners submits that nothing survives in the matter.

5. In view of the foregoing, this petition is disposed of. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Thakur